



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,719	09/29/2005	Tobias Helbig	DE 020273	8492
24737 7590 09/03/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
ABYANEH, ALI S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2137				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/03/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,719

Applicant(s)

HELBIG ET AL.

Examiner

ALI S. ABYANEH

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

It is not clear in the layout of the specification as where the back ground, summary or detailed description starts and ends. Appropriate correction is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.

(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.

(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.

(d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on

compact discs.) or REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)

(e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A

"Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required

"Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim objections

3. Claim 1-19 are objected to for because of the following informalities:

Claims include numbers referring to the drawing. For more clarity examiner suggests to remove the numbers from the claim language.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claim 1-19 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/522,289. Claims 1-15 of Application 10/522,289 contain every element of claims 1-19 of the instant application and as such anticipate claims 1-19 of the instant application. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

"A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents); *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d at 1437, 46 USPQ2d at 1233 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting where a patent application claim to a genus is

anticipated by a patent claim to a species within that genus). " ELI LILLY AND COMPANY v BARR LABORATORIES, INC., United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, ON PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC (DECIDED: May 30, 2001).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hermann (EP 1024626 A1).

Regarding claim 1, 18 and 19

Herman teaches a security system for networks, particularly wireless networks, comprising a portable unit with a key unit for making a key record available and being provided for short-range information transmission of the key record and at least one receiving unit in at least one apparatus of the network, comprising a receiver for receiving the key record and an evaluation component of the apparatus for storing, processing and/or passing on the key record or a part of the key record to a second component (paragraph [0044]-[0046]).

Regarding claim 2-4

Hermann furthermore teaches the security system, characterized in that the unit comprises at least one triggering unit for triggering a short-range transmission of information, particularly a short-range information transmission of the key record; upon a user's approach to the receiving unit, a detector unit in the unit triggers the short-range information transmission of the key record; and the key unit comprises a key generator (14) for generating a sequence of guest key records (paragraph [0019]-[0020]).

Regarding claim 5-7

Hermann furthermore teaches the security system is provided for erasing the key record; the key record (4, 17, 104) consists of a bit sequence and the bit sequence comprises characterizing bits used for distinguishing and characterizing key records (paragraph [0020]-[0021]).

Regarding claim 8-10

Hermann furthermore teaches the unit is a part of an apparatus, particularly a remote control unit (paragraph [0044]); the key record is supplied during or before a network configuration, particularly an automatic network configuration, of an apparatus; and the apparatus is provided for authentication, encryption and/or decryption, by means of a key in the key record of useful data transmitted between the apparatuses of the network (paragraph [0020]-[0021]).

Regarding claim 12-15

Hermann furthermore teaches a security system as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the key unit comprises a reading device for reading a mobile data memory, particularly a chip card having a decoding key record stored thereon; the key unit comprises a writing device for writing data into the mobile data memory; the unit and the apparatus are adapted to transmit a confirmation by the apparatus to the unit, indicating the consequence of performing an instruction transmitted from the unit to the apparatus; the confirmation comprises an identification code for the apparatus (paragraph [0047]-[0048]).

Regarding claim 16

Hermann furthermore teaches the key unit is adapted to store useful data in the mobile data memory, allowing the management of key records read from the data memory and installed on apparatuses, and block the transmission of a key record from the mobile data memory to an apparatus in case said useful data comply with a predetermined criterion (paragraph [0044]).

Regarding claim 17

Hermann furthermore teaches the unit comprises a triggering unit whose activation causes the apparatus to erase a key record (paragraph [0020]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hermann (EP 1024626 A1) in view of Coppersmith et al. (EP 0843425).

Regarding claim 11

Hermann teaches all limitation of the claim as applied to claim 1 above. Hermann does not explicitly teach a memory for **storing** a worldwide unambiguous key record. However, in an analogous art, Coppersmith teaches storing a worldwide unambiguous key record (column 20, line 23).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hermann to include storing a worldwide unambiguous key record. This would have been obvious because person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do so in order to retrieve and use the stored key later.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ali Abyaneh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on **(571) 272-3865**. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned as (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/A. S. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2137
08-29-2008

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137